

ATTACHMENT A

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Messages from Task Force Members Doug Wheeler and Dr. Jane Pisano in Support of March 14, 2006 MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Decision

From: Wheeler, Douglas P. [mailto:DPWheeler@HHLAW.COM]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 12:52 PM
To: John Kirlin
Cc: Phil Isenberg
Subject: RE: Histograms and map of Package 3R

Chairman Isenberg: As you know, it was necessary for me to leave the Task Force meeting somewhat early on Wednesday afternoon, in order to catch a Washington-bound flight. Before leaving, I cast a vote in favor of forwarding packages 1, 2 and 3R, with the preferred alternative being 3R as developed by staff, in consultation with the interested stakeholders. Your message today makes clear that package 3R was further revised subsequent to my departure, and that a plurality of my colleagues agreed to adoption of 3R as the preferred alternative. Having now had an opportunity to review 3R, as further revised, and the accompanying graphics, I am all the more convinced that this alternative fully satisfies our mandate, and, when implemented, will provide exemplary protection for the Central Coast marine ecosystem. Accordingly, I ask that you record my vote in favor of 3R, as further revised, to be the preferred alternative. Doug Wheeler.

From: jpisano [mailto:jpisano@nhm.org]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2006 5:04 PM
To: John Kirlin; Ann D'Amato; Cathy Reheis-Boyd; Doug Wheeler; Meg Caldwell; Phil Isenberg; Susan Golding; William Anderson
Subject: Re: Histograms and map of Package 3R

Dear John:

I regret that I could not attend the March 14-15 meeting of the BRTF. As you know, the meeting conflicted with my own Board of Trustees meeting. I have, however, carefully read the briefing book prepared for the meeting. I have also reviewed your presentation to the BRTF on March 14 and the meeting summary you provided. Although I was not able to benefit from the discussion during two very full meeting days, I believe the BRTF came to a solid recommendation for Package 3R which I would also endorse.

My big picture view is of the similarities among Package 1, 2R and 3R in Number of MPAs, total Area of MPAs and Percentage of Study Region. Clearly any of these solutions provides more protection than the status quo. On balance, Package 3R seems to me to be a reasonable compromise which will provide protection to the Central Coast marine ecosystem as envisaged in the MLPA. As this proposal proceeds through the Fish and Game Commission review process, I hope it will be embraced by the Commission and by the stakeholders.

Many thanks to Phil and to you for your leadership and hard work on this. Sincerely, Jane